

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 AMELIA BUTLER,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 SI HO RAUGH,

13 Defendant.

CASE NO. C19-964RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

14
15 This matter is before the Court sua sponte following the Minute Order of the Honorable
16 John C. Coughenour directing the Clerk to reassign Case No. C19-965RSM to the Undersigned
17 (formerly Case No. C19-965JCC). In that case, Judge Coughenour's order for reassignment
18 followed Defendant's Notice of Related Cases (Dkt. #12 in Case No. C19-965RSM) detailing
19 the relatedness of this case and Case No. C19-964RSM. Defendant has also filed a similar Notice
20 of Related Cases in this action. Dkt. #13. The Court agrees with Judge Coughenour and
21 Defendant that these two actions are indeed related as provided in Local Civil Rule 3(g)(4) and
22 that it appears that parallel litigation will be duplicitous and an undue burden on the Court and
23 the parties.
24

25 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42, where "actions before the court involve
26 a common question of law or fact, the court may: (1) join for hearing or trial any or all matters

1 at issue in the actions; (2) consolidate the actions; or (3) issue any other orders to avoid
2 unnecessary cost or delay.” FED. R. CIV. P. 42(A). Both a court’s inherent power to control and
3 manage its own docket and the wording of Rule 42 support a court consolidating cases sua sponte
4 and even over the objection of the parties. *Prestige v. United States*, No. CV-14-413-PHX-DKD,
5 2014 WL 11332313, at *2 (D. Ariz. Mar. 10, 2014) (citing *In re Adams Apple, Inc.*, 829 F.2d
6 1484, 1487 (9th Cir. 1987) (“Because consolidation is within the broad discretion of the district
7 court, . . . trial courts may consolidate cases *sua sponte* [.]”); *Blasko v. Washington Metropolitan*
8 *Area Transit Authority*, 243 F.R.D. 13, 15 (D.D.C. 2007) (“By its plain language, Rule 42(a)
9 permits *sua sponte* consolidation.”)).
10

11 Nevertheless, the Court finds it appropriate to provide the parties an opportunity to
12 address the issue. Accordingly, the Court finds and ORDERS that **within fourteen (14) days of**
13 **this Order** each party may show cause: (1) why this case is or is not related to Case No. C19-
14 965RSM and (2) why this case should or should not be consolidated with Case No. C19-
15 965RSM. Any response to this Order shall be **limited to five double-spaced pages**. The Clerk
16 shall mail Plaintiff a copy of this Order at: P.O. Box 3388, Federal Way, Washington 98063.
17

18 Dated this 24 day of July, 2019.

19
20 

21 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
22 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26